Summary of Phase I: Molding a Shared Vision

September 1995 to April 1996

Prepared for:

MetroGIS Phase II Kick Off Forum
May 16, 1996

Prepared by:

GIS Department
Metropolitan Council
May 1996

Welcome to the MetroGIS Phase II "Kick Off" Forum and thank you for offering your time and talents to help shape the MetroGIS. The purpose of this document is to chronicle the events and activities that crystallized the components of the MetroGIS vision that you will learn about today.

I. Why a Metro-Wide GIS?

The Metropolitan Council is charged by the State Legislature to provide leadership that results in policies and mechanisms to wisely use the Metro Area's land resources and to cost-effectively operate the regional systems (highways, transit, wastewater treatment, airports, and parks). The Council has developed and maintains several datasets that are used to forecast and analyze the impacts of development on regional systems and growth management policies.

In the fall of the 1994, the Metropolitan Council concluded that it also needs a parcel-based geographic information system (GIS) to more effectively accomplish its Legislative mandates. The Council also concluded that the public interest would be well served if it invested its resources in a collaborative venture with the counties and others to develop a regional GIS rather than attempt to build and maintain a stand alone system. Another high priority of the Metropolitan Council is to cultivate a cooperative and collaborative environment for problem solving with other units of government that serve the Metro Area.

Recognizing that the collaborative creation of a regional GIS could simultaneously accomplish two of its high priority goals, the Metropolitan Council authorized: 1) the hiring of four new staff persons (a GIS Liaison and three GIS Specialists) who came to the project in August 1995, 2) the purchase of nearly $400,000 in GIS hardware and software to support the development of a regional system, and 3) expenditure of significant additional funds for pilot projects that foster the institutional and technical knowledge necessary to implement a regional system.

II. Assessment of Support for a Collaborative Effort:

In August 1995, representatives from twenty-nine multi-participant GIS efforts throughout the US and Canada were contacted in hopes of gaining insight that might be useful to this effort. We quickly realized that this effort would be charting significant new ground; none of the twenty-nine programs involved more than two counties and no one had attempted to integrate all local, metropolitan, state, and federal government interests into a single, multi-county GIS.

A listing of Metro Area organizations that would/could have a interest in the development of a regional GIS (now being referred to as the MetroGIS) was prepared. Persons affiliated with these interests and prominent in the Metro Area GIS community were spoken with to promote the concept of a developing a GIS to serve the Metro Area. Communication with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information was established with the appointment of Richard Johnson, Associate Regional Administrator of the Metropolitan Council.

Each of the Metropolitan Council's staff to the MetroGIS also serves on a committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information.

In September 1995, Rick Gelbmann, GIS Coordinator for the Metropolitan Council, moderated a panel discussion at the GIS/LIS State Conference entitled "Regional GIS - New Directions in GIS at the Metropolitan Council". Gary Stevenson (Director of Surveying and Land Records for Dakota County); Richard Elhart (GIS Administrator with NSP); Julie Erickson (Planning Coordinator with the City of St. Louis Park); and Randall Johnson (GIS Liaison for the Metropolitan Council) talked about the benefits of a regional GIS and some of the problems that will need to be overcome. The concept of a developing a regional GIS was well received.

On October 23 and 26, 1995, the Metropolitan Council and the Minnesota Land Management Information Center (LMIC) co-hosted two GIS Forums entitled "Metro-Wide GIS: A Means to Improve Organizational Efficiency and Reduce Costs". (Refer to Attachment A for the forum agenda.)

Invitations were mailed to the chief elected and administrative officials for all units of local government serving the Metro Area. Representatives from numerous state and federal agencies, non-profits, academic institutions, economic development associations, and associations of local governments and of local officials were also invited. Everyone who received an invitation was encouraged to identify issues that must be addressed to implement a regional GIS. Numerous comments were received. These issues have been incorporated into the strategic planning effort.

These forums were also held in the cities of Maplewood and Eden Prairie in an attempt to obtain broad geographic input, as well as, broad organizational input concerning the desirability of a regional GIS and the appropriateness of the Metropolitan Council's acceptance of a leadership role in its creation. Over 150 persons attended, representing 88 different organizations. Strong support was expressed for the concept of a regional GIS and for the Metropolitan Council assuming leadership role.

III. A Shared Vision

In November 1995, Dr. John Bryson and Charles Finn of the Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota agreed to assist Metropolitan Council staff with the strategic planning for this effort. Their assistance was sought because of their significant expertise with development of public policy and strategic planning and because the University of Minnesota's Geography Department was an early leader in the development of GIS technology. Their charge was to facilitate agreement among key Metro-Area stakeholders as to the purpose of a regional GIS and how to go about creating and maintaining it.

On December 14, 1995, Dr. Bryson and Mr. Finn facilitated a day-long Strategic Planning Retreat at the Wilder Forest Facility, near Stillwater. Eighteen stakeholder representatives attended. They represented all levels of government, including the Federal Geographic Data Commission's National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) program, and private sector interests. A consensus-building technique entitled "concept mapping" was utilized. (See Attachment B for a summary of the retreat, a list of the attendees, and an overview of the "concept mapping" process.)

The group built upon the 60-plus comments received from the GIS Forums and by the end of the day had assembled over 250 action items that must be dealt with to successfully implement a regional GIS. Fourteen of these items were cited as strategic issues critical to the creation and operation of a regional GIS. Consensus was also reached on six high-level goals for the regional GIS. The group agreed to meet on January 25, 1996, to discuss the "next steps" in the process. (The action items identified at the retreat were consolidated into a packet of 8 1/2 x 11 color "concept maps". These maps will be provided to each Strategic Issue Advisory Team for reference.)

IV. Refining the Framework Components

Over the course of four half-day meetings, beginning on January 25, 1996, and ending on April 26, 1996, the Strategic Planning Group (now referred to as the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee) crafted the components of the framework to bring the MetroGIS into existence. (See Attachment C for the agenda for each of the four meetings. The minutes are available upon request.) The MetroGIS vision framework consists of the following described components, each of which was developed through a consensus process:

- Statement Intent for a Regional GIS (*MetroGIS*)
- Statement of the Metropolitan Council Role (in the Creation of MetroGIS)
- Strategic Issues
- MetroGIS Decision Support Structure
- Purpose Statement for each Strategic Issue Advisory Team
- Preliminary Project Timeline

Statement of Intent for a Regional GIS (*MetroGIS*)
On March 22, 1996, the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee unanimously endorsed the following statement to guide the creation and operation of the MetroGIS:

"Provide an ongoing, stakeholder governed, metro-wide mechanism through which participants easily and equitably share geographically-referenced graphic and associated attribute data that are accurate, current, of common benefit and readily usable.

The desired outcomes of a regional GIS include:

- Improve the effectiveness, equitability, responsiveness, and efficiency of participant operations.
- Improve understanding of the dynamics of the seven county Metro Area and cooperatively chart courses to improve the quality of life and competitiveness for economic development.
- Reduce the cost of data acquisition, management, and maintenance.
- Increase credibility of data utilized in cross-jurisdictional decision making; minimize data redundancy."

Statement of the Metropolitan Council Role (in the Creation of the MetroGIS)

On February 8, 1996, the Metropolitan Council unanimously adopted the following statement of its role in the creation of the MetroGIS in exactly the form that had been accepted by the MetroGIS Coordinating Team:

"The Metropolitan Council has accepted a leadership role to create a metro-wide GIS; an entity through which widespread sharing and exchange of GIS data sets and technology can become a reality among public agencies and private-sector organizations within the seven-county metropolitan area. "Leadership" is defined as the following activities:

- Finance, coordinate, and support the strategic planning and decision-making processes,
- Develop and maintain regional data sets (e.g., land use, census geography/TAZ, road centerline & census address range, soils, imagery, administrative boundaries),
- Provide support (staff and/or equipment) to the visioning/coordination team and to strategic issue teams,
- Finance and support communication with stakeholders (activity status and opportunities to participate),
- Selectively design, finance, coordinate, and staff projects that address local GIS and MetroGIS program needs,
- Facilitate the execution of data/cost sharing agreements among stakeholders,
- Participate financially in a fair share of the long term maintenance of the MetroGIS,
- Any other activities consistent with the strategic plan and acceptable to all affected parties."

Strategic Issues

The MetroGIS Coordinating Committee synthesized the 250-plus action items identified at the December 1995 Retreat into fourteen Strategic Issues and grouped them into four issue themes, as follows:

Data Access
Define data delivery mechanism
Make data accessible at low cost
Keep data current and accurate

Data Content
Determine user accuracy needs
Decide which data are needed by participants in regional GIS
Define output/products from system
Define structure of logically integrated system

Governance (Now Policy)
Be politically supported
Have effective fair governance of participant entities
Decide intent of regional GIS
Secure long term funding
Share resources

Standards
Have Standards
Standardize data across the region

MetroGIS Decision Support Structure (Organizational Structure)

On April 26, 1996, the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee unanimously accepted the decision support structure that is illustrated and described on the following two pages. This structure is intended to bring the MetroGIS into existence and to make it possible for the various review/decision bodies to begin to make informed decisions. Once operational, the Policy Board could revise this initial structure.

Purpose Statement for each Strategic Issue Advisory Team

Four Strategic Issue Advisory Teams will evaluate alternatives and recommend courses of action for consideration by the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee. At its April 26th meeting, the Coordinating Committee unanimously accepted the following Purpose Statements to focus the work of each of these Advisory Teams:

Access: Identify the mechanisms for indexing, describing, and accessing current, accurate, and usable geographically-referenced graphic and associated attribute data.

Content: Identify the data sets and their characteristics which provide the greatest utility for the Metro Area GIS data user community.

Policy: (formerly Governance): Identify strategies to obtain stakeholder commitment and financial support for a sustainable MetroGIS.

Standards: Identify or develop standards that allow data sharing among the participants of the MetroGIS.

Preliminary Timeline

The Coordinating Committee has prepared a preliminary work program that will be refined as the teams prepare detailed work programs for their individual area of responsibility. This exercise was undertaken to focus each team's work to the extent possible with the information that was available at that time. The preliminary timeline suggests it will take at least 30 months from the time the teams begin to meet to operationalize the MetroGIS. This preliminary plan will be provided to each team as they begin work on their individual work programs.

V. Interim Data/Cost Sharing Agreements and Pilot Projects

In December 1995, Metropolitan Council staff began meeting with officials from the seven Metro- Area counties and other key Metro Area data producers whose participation is key to the successful implementation of a regional GIS. The purpose of these meetings has been to learn about local GIS program assets that would be valuable to the regional effort and local GIS program needs. Based upon these discussions, Metropolitan Council staff began to secure interim data/cost sharing agreements with key regional GIS data producers. The interim agreements are intended to be superseded by agreements endorsed by the MetroGIS Policy Board. These negotiations are continuing with each of the seven counties and others.

The interim agreements are between the Metropolitan Council and the data producer. They are being pursued to provide the environment necessary to work through the variety of institutional and technical issues that will need to be resolved to implement a regional GIS. Significant Metropolitan Council resources are being offered to update and enhance local data bases, build functionality that does not exist, and establish data transfer procedures to overcome institutional and technical obstacles to cross-organization sharing of data.

VI. Early MetroGIS Success Story

Last Fall, Metropolitan Council staff held several meetings with officials from the seven counties, state and federal agencies, and utility companies to discuss a cooperative aerial flight program.

These discussions began as part of laying the foundation for the cooperative development of a regional GIS. A cooperative agreement was reached for a 5000-foot altitude flight in April/May 1996 that includes all of Ramsey and Washington Counties, all of Minneapolis, and parts of Dakota and Scott Counties. The entire Metro Area is also being flown at 19,200 feet in Phase I April/May 1996. Negotiations for a 5000-foot flight in 1997 for other parts of the Metro Area will commence later this year. The collaborative approach resulted in a innovative way to meet everyone's needs and significant cost savings are expected to be realized by all parties.

VII. Communication with Stakeholders

Upon implementation of Phase II, the complexity of the MetroGIS effort will drastically increase. Phase I consisted of a 21-person Coordinating Committee that met once a month. Phase II will eventually evolve to a six-body decision making structure, involving over 80 persons, with four of the groups meeting on a monthly basis. Consequently, timely communication of the issues, strategies, and decisions is a high priority not only to keep MetroGIS team participants informed but also to keep stakeholders, in general, informed.

In addition to hosting regular meetings of the team leadership, the Metropolitan Council is proposing to support a MetroGIS newsletter (the frequency is yet to be determined) which would be mailed/e-mailed to all organizations that have or could have an interest in the MetroGIS. A MetroGIS home page on the Internet is also being developed by the Council to make extensive, up-to-date information about the MetroGIS effort readily available for routine inquiries.

A wide variety of information would be made available through the home page including meeting agendas and minutes, reports, status of pilot projects, listing of participants, information about data availability, hyperlinks to other home pages and to other documents, contacts for further information, a bulletin board through which stakeholders can post questions/comments, etc.

May 16, 1996: Phase II Begins

In today's break-out sessions, the expectations for each of the Strategic Issue Advisory Teams will be explained. *On behalf of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, thank you for accepting our invitation to participate in this exciting collaborative process that, to our knowledge, is unequaled in the country.*

ATTACHMENT A

Regional GIS Information Forums
October 23 and 26, 1995

METRO-WIDE GIS: A MEANS TO IMPROVE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S EFFECTIVENESS AND REDUCE COSTS

FORUM PROGRAM

MONDAY, OCT 23, 1995
1 P.M. TO 4:30 P.M.
MAPLEWOOD COMMUNITY CENTER

THURSDAY, OCT 26, 1995
1 P.M. TO 4:30 P.M.
EDEN PRAIRIE CITY HALL

1:00-1:10 Welcome

1:10-1:30 Overview of Geographic Information System (GIS) Technology - David Arbeit, director of the Minnesota Land Management Information Center (LMIC)

1:30-2:45 How Multi-Participant GIS Efforts Can Pay Dividends for the Individual Participants

Speaker - Will Calicott, vice-president of the North Texas GIS Consortium and GIS coordinator for the City of Dallas

Speaker - Scott Beckman, director of the Dakota County Economic Development Partnership ***(October 23, 1995)***

Speaker - Clark Evans, director of Technology and Media, Minnetonka School District ***(October 26, 1995)***

2:45-3:00 Break

3:00-3:30 Strategy to Create a Metro-Area GIS

Speaker - Jim Solem, executive director, Metropolitan Council

Speaker - Rick Gelbmann, GIS coordinator, Metropolitan Council

3:30-4:20 Development of a Metro-Area GIS -- Panel Discussion and Questions from the Audience

Moderator - Will Craig, assistant director, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA)

- Will Calicott, vice president, North Texas GIS Consortium
- David Arbeit, director, Minnesota Land Management Information Center (LMIC)
- Scott Beckman, director, Dakota County Economic Development Partnership ***(October 23, 1995)***
- Clark Evans, director of Technology and Media Minnetonka School District ***(October 26, 1995***)
- Rick Gelbmann, GIS coordinator, Metropolitan Council

4:20-4:30 Closing

ATTACHMENT B

MetroGIS Strategic Planning Retreat Summary
December 14, 1995

John Bryson and Charles Finn with the Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota facilitated this one day session that began at 8:30 a.m. It was held at the Wilder Forest Conference facility, located northwest of Stillwater. A list of the participants is attached.

The first item of business involved discussion and modification of a preliminary list of Metro Area GIS stakeholders. Several modifications were agreed upon. The group was then asked to begin a "concept-mapping" process -- the objective being to identify of goals, strategic issues, tasks, and priorities necessary to create a MetroGIS. (Note: A detailed summary of the expectations, time commitment, and procedure used to facilitate for each step of the concept-mapping process will be include in the documentation of the entire strategic planning process.)

The process began with discussion of a "starter pack" of goal and issue statements. These statements had been prepared by the Metropolitan Council GIS staff to incorporate comments received during previous discussions with stakeholders and from the GIS Forums held in October into the discussion. The participants accepted each of the "starter pack" statements and decided how they related to one another. (Each statement was written on a yellow oval and placed on a large sheet of paper attached to a wall and grouped by common themes.) The consensus of the group was that these statements could be assigned to three broad planning themes -- governance, system management, and data content. Numerous other goal and issue statements were then added by the participants under each of the three theme areas.

After lunch, the participants broke into three groups of six persons; each randomly assigned to refine one of three theme areas of goals and issues created by the larger group. Members of the smaller groups added additional action items and goal statements that they believed necessary for a successful effort. The smaller groups also drew arrows to identify "influence" relationships between the various component strategies and action items. The smaller groups then reconvened as a large group to explain and discuss the detail and connectivity that had been added to the concept-map structure.

The entire group then reevaluated the high level goals that it believed should guide the development of the MetroGIS. It was agreed that the ultimate goal should be to create a system that helps each participant organization cost-effectively achieve its mission -- "promote effective, responsive, and efficient operations". Four other high order supporting goals were added to link the three major themes of governance, system management, and data content: a) reduce the cost of governance and provide improved service, b) support better decision making for (MetroGIS) participants, c) support better relationships among participants, and d) promote new definition of community: independent to interdependent and competitive to cooperative.

There was some discussion about listing specific objectives, such as "enhancing economic development" or "being more responsive to regional issues". Several participants expressed concern that including one such objective would require the naming of numerous other laudable objectives. It was decided that a single goal -- to help stakeholders achieve their various missions -- would be the best way to remain focused.

The final activity of the December 14, 1995, strategic planning retreat required each participant to "vote" for the concepts that they believed to be critical to successful implementation of the MetroGIS. Each participant was given five green dots to illustrate their short-term priorities (completed in one year or less) and five orange dots for their long term high priority concepts. The priority ranking exercise concluded at 5:15 p.m.

The group agreed to reconvene to decide and prioritize the "next steps" to pursue for the MetroGIS project. Metropolitan Council staff agreed to prepare a report to summarize the results of this retreat for the "next steps" discussion. The session adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Prepared by:

Randall Johnson. AICP
GIS Liaison

Concept Mapping for Strategic Planning - Process Outline

1. Confirm Stakeholder List

Objective: Insure all key stakeholders have been identified
Time: 30 min.
Process: - Introductions of those present
- Define the word "stakeholder"
- Show pre-made lists of stakeholders and ask "who is missing from this list?"
- Optional: Identify who the "inner ring" stakeholders are

2. Identify Candidate Goals and Key Actions

Objective: To brainstorm all possible goals and key actions for the project
Time: 2 hours
Process:

- Introduce participants to oval mapping process
- Optional: jump-start the process with potential goals from respected literature related to the topic
- Provide participants with stack of ovals and "blue tack"
- Participants write ideas for goals on the ovals (use red markers for goals)
- Facilitators post ovals and begin to cluster ideas as soon as it seems possible.
- Most abstract and general ideas/goals are posted on the top of the map while more specific and detailed ideas are put further down on the map. Tell the group that later in the day they will refine the hierarchy and draw inter-connections.
- Have participants switch to black markers as the ideas become more detailed
- Facilitators may need to push participants thinking to the upper part of the map. Ask, "Can we go one level higher?"
- Get 300-400 ideas out there if need be.
- Once ideas are all out provide an overview of the process for this strategy workshop. Make the following points:
  - Typically public policy strategy is to simplify which often results in over-simplification. This mapping process lets the issue be as complex as it is. "Things should be made as simple as possible, but no simpler." -Albert Einstein
  - It is not possible to change someone else's view. Help another to elaborate enough on their own view so they change their own mind and so some kind of shared understanding is possible. Common ground is found in the areas where our interest intersect.

3. Create Main Clusters and Small Groups

Objective: Find the 3-5 natural clusters within the goals/ideas and create small groups for each cluster.
Time: 1 hr., 45 min.
Process:

- Optional: Add ideas (ovals) that were created during previous sessions
- Ask: "Are there clusters that have emerged from these ideas?" Do some of the ovals need to be moved?"
- Once the facilitator has determined an area where a line should be drawn to separate into cluster, read out loud the ovals along the border to achieve consensus about which cluster those ovals belong to.
- Draw the border lines in pencil in case you need to move them.
- Separate the group into small groups assigned to each cluster in whichever way seems most appropriate.
- Give instructions for small group work: 1) pull ovals apart on your map surface, 2) sub-cluster the ovals, 3) eliminate the duplicates, but keep two similar items if there is a slight difference, 4) draw interconnections with arrows (use pencils). First find the most vague and draw an arrow out to the oval that is a possible outcome of that action. Look for arrows to go only one way. If it looks like it should go two ways, something is probably missing. Create loops only if they are necessary, and 5) feel free to add ovals that seem to be missing as you cluster.

4. Small Groups Complete Their Work

Objective: Create a map for each cluster
Time: 1 hour or more
Process:

- Cut the backdrop paper apart around the clusters and spread the cluster maps around the room so small groups have enough room to work.
- Ask the small group members to gather around their map and begin their work. Participants will need to be standing and actively moving ovals on their maps.
- Facilitator monitors each group to confirm understanding of the process and to be sure small groups are on the right track.

5. Plenary

Objective: Small groups present their maps to the large group and cluster map interconnections are made
Time: 45 min
Process:

- One member from each group presents the map to the large group.
- After the presentations the facilitator helps the group identify where the maps interconnect.

6. Identify Key Strategic Issues

Objective: Review maps to identify the strategic issues and connect them to the goals
Time: 45 min
Process:

- Either have the small groups or the large group examine the maps to help locate the strategic issues. Strategic issues are those that are fundamental challenges, involve long-term commitments and would be irrevocable commitments.
- Label the ovals that represent strategic issues with a blue sticky dot.
- Make a duplicate oval of this item.
- Take these ovals to the goals that were identified in the first morning session and map their interconnections on a clean backdrop.

7. Identify the key short and long-term priorities

Objective: Participants identify short and long-term priorities
Time: 20 min
Process:

- Give each participant 5 green dots (short-term) and 5 orange dots (long-term).
- Have the participants look at all the cluster maps and "vote" for the 5 highest priority short-term actions with the green dots and the 5 highest priority long-term actions with the orange dots.
- As a large group, look at the results of the voting. Ask if there are any surprises or observations the participants want to share.

8. Action Planning and Closing

Objective: To determine next-step actions and close the session
Time: 30-45 min
Process:

- Ask the group what they want to have happen next. In what form would they like to see the map results? What actions should the planning session sponsors take? What actions should the participants take?
- Lead the group in a reflection of the day by asking some key questions.

PARTICIPANTS

MetroGIS
Strategic Planning Session
December 14, 1995

Facilitators: John Bryson and Charles Finn, Humphrey Institute-University of Minnesota.

Federal: Michael Domaratz (US Geological Survey and the Federal Geographic Data Committees, National Spatial Data Infrastructure [NSDI] project. The NSDI project is in process of developing guidelines and strategies to promote multi-participant GIS throughout the nation.)

State: David Arbeit, Minnesota Land Management Information Center (LMIC)

Metropolitan: Richard Johnson and Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council (MetroGIS Sponsor)

County: Dakota: Gary Stevenson (surveyor, urban/rural, leader in partnered GIS); Ramsey: David Claypool (surveyor, urban, leader GPS/GIS, leader partnered GIS); Carver - Dave Drealan (planner, mostly rural, beginning GIS); Anoka: Margo LaBau (manager - oversees GIS and surveying functions); Hennepin: Pat O'Connor (auditor - oversees taxation and surveying and involved in the redesign of the County GIS.)

Cities: Brad Henry, City of Minneapolis (core city & city engineering); Dennis Welsch, City of Roseville (suburban city & city planning)

Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger, Ramsey-Metro-Washington Watershed District

School Districts: Clark Evans, Minnetonka School District (Implemented GIS for school census/transportation/etc.); Jim Sydow, Director of Technology - TIES (Developing new Oracle database to link school domicile records with county parcel data)

Universities: Will Craig, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs - University of Minnesota

Utilities: Alan Srock, NSP (MetroGIS Sponsor)

Multi-jurisdiction economic development: Scott Beckman, Dakota County Economic Development Partnership (leading edge work to link city planning and county parcel data)

GIS consultant: John Carpenter, Insight Mapping & Demographic (multi-participant GIS, economic development, school district, city, county issues)

Business Geographics - Tim Nuteson, Dayton Hudson Corporation

ATTACHMENT C

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
Meeting Summaries

January 25 to April 26, 1996

NEXT STEPS FORUM
MetroGIS

Thursday, January 25, 1996
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 156
St. Paul Campus of the
University of Minnesota
1890 Buford Avenue

AGENDA

11:30-11:55 -- **Arrival and Lunch**. Box lunches will be provided.

11:55-12:00 -- **Welcome** - Richard Johnson, Deputy Regional Administrator, Metropolitan Council

- **Review and confirm MetroGIS "concept maps"**
  (Emphasis on accuracy of strategic issues and attachment of action items to appropriate strategic issues.)

- **Prioritize and group strategic issues**

- **Review and agree upon interim decision making structure**

  1. Retain strategic planning group as "visioning/coordinating" team
  2. Create "teams" to address the strategic issues
  3. Define basic "team" operating procedures
  4. Create an "administrative procedures" team

2:30-2:45 -- **Break**

Form "strategic issue" teams
(Select core member(s) from strategic planning participants for highest priority strategic issues.)

Form an "administrative procedures" team
(Select member(s) from strategic planning participants)

Set dates for "team" and "visioning group" meetings

Comments --- Definition of Metropolitan Council's MetroGIS facilitation role

Comments --- Proposed means of communicating strategic planning results with stakeholders

4:00 -- **Closing**

MetroGIS
Visioning/Coordinating Team Meeting

Tuesday, February 27, 1996
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 156
St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota
8:30 a.m. - Noon

Agenda

A memorandum is enclosed to explain each agenda item and any suggested action.
Please plan to arrive about 10 minutes early to review any additional handout materials.

1. Acceptance of Meeting Summary
   a) January 25, 1996, meeting

2. Status/Progress Report -- MetroGIS-Related Activities
   a) Council's GIS Needs Assessment
   b) Preliminary Draft -- Council's GIS "status/needs/benefits worksheet

3. Intent of MetroGIS

** 4. Group and Define Related Strategic Issues

5. Revised Interim Decision Making Structure
   a) Consistency requirement
   b) Process-Meeting Planning Subgroup
   c) Metropolitan Council role statement
   d) Clarify team roles

6. Create Strategic Issue Teams
   a) Identification of Team Interest
   b) Short Term Team Objectives

7. Interim Data/Cost Sharing Agreements
   a) MetroGIS Agreement-in-Principle with Ramsey County

8. Next Visioning/Coordinating Team Meeting
   a) Date
   b) Volunteers

9. Adjourn

** Includes an exercise that we suggest you complete before the meeting

MetroGIS
Visioning/Coordinating Team Meeting

Friday, March 22, 1996

*******University of St. Thomas *******
Murray Herrick Building - Room 113

8:30 a.m.

Agenda

A memorandum is enclosed to explain each agenda item and suggested action.
Please plan to arrive about 10 minutes early to review any additional handout materials.

1. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries
   a) February 27, meeting
   b) March 7, 1996 (Meeting Planning Subgroup)

2. Intent of MetroGIS - Accept Revised Statement

3. Interim MetroGIS Decision Making Structure
   a) Involvement of Elected Officials/Role of Visioning/Coordinating Team Members
** b) Procedures Visioning/Coordinating Team

4. Strategic Issue Teams
   a) Confirm Liaisons from Visioning/Coordinating Team
   b) Procedure to Select other Members

5. Next Meeting
   a) Date
   b) Volunteers -- Meeting Preparation
   c) Possible Topics:
   * Review MetroGIS Work Program (Gant Chart Results)
   * Definition of Strategic Issues to Be Initially Addressed
   * Guidelines for Selection of Pilot Projects and Interim Data/Cost Agreements
   * Metropolitan Council's GIS "Status/Needs/Benefits" Worksheet

6. Adjourn

** Includes an exercise that we suggest you complete before the meeting

MetroGIS
Coordinating Team Meeting

Friday April 26, 1996
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 156
St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota

8:30 to 10:30 A.M.

Agenda

A memorandum is enclosed to explain each agenda item and suggested actions.
Please plan to arrive about 10 minutes early to review any additional handout materials.

1. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries:
   a) March 22, 1996 (Coordinating Team)
   b) March 27, 1996 (Interim Governance Team)
   c) March 29, 1996 (4/26 Meeting Planning Group)

2. Refinement of Interim MetroGIS Decision Support Structure
   -- Add a Policy Board and Steering Committee

3. Selection of Coordinating Team Chairperson

4. Strategic Issue Teams:
   a) Status of Member Recruitment
   b) Endorsement of Mission Statement for Each Team

5. Phase II "Kick-off" Forum -- May 16, 1996

6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities:
   a) Interim Data/Cost Sharing Agreement/Pilot Project Guidelines
   b) MetroGIS Logo
   c) Metropolitan Council's GIS Needs Assessment
   d) Preliminary Draft -- Council's GIS "status/needs/benefits worksheet"
   e) Discussions with Stakeholders/Pending Agreements/Pilot Projects
   f) Other?

7. Next Meeting:
   a) Coordinating Team (one month after May 16th Phase II kick off session)
   b) Volunteer(s) to Discuss Next Coordinating Team Agenda
   c) Interim Governance Team

8. Adjourn